

Units (FIUs) where we do not already have them, in line with our national constitutions and legal systems, to collect and analyse information on those engaged in money laundering and liaise with the equivalent agencies in partner countries. We agreed on principles and the need for adequate legislation to facilitate asset confiscation from convicted criminals, including ways to help each other trace, freeze and confiscate those assets, and where possible, in accordance with national legislation, share seized assets with other nations.

- We agree on the need to explore ways of combating official corruption arising from the large flows of criminal money.
- We are deeply concerned by all forms of trafficking of human beings including the smuggling of migrants. We agreed to joint action to combat trafficking in women and children, including efforts to prevent such crimes, protect victims and prosecute the traffickers. We commit ourselves to develop a multidisciplinary and comprehensive strategy, including principles and an action plan for future cooperation amongst ourselves and with third countries, including countries of origin, transit and destination, to tackle this problem. We consider the future comprehensive UN organised crime convention an important instrument for this purpose.
- We endorse joint law enforcement action against organised crime and welcome the cooperation between competent agencies in tackling criminal networks. We agree to pursue further action, particularly in dealing with major smuggling routes and targeting specific forms of financial fraud.
- We endorse the Lyon Group's principles and action plan to combat illegal manufacturing and trafficking of firearms. We welcome its agreement to work towards the elaboration of a binding international legal instrument in the context of the UN transnational organised crime convention.

5. We urge the Lyon Group to intensify its on-going work and ask our Ministers to report back to our next Summit on progress on the action plan on high tech crime, the steps taken against money laundering and the

joint action on trafficking in human beings. We also welcome the steps agreed by our Environment Ministers on 5 April to combat environmental crime.

6. There is a strong link between drugs and wider international and domestic crime. We welcome the forthcoming UNGASS on drugs. This should signal the international community's determination in favour of a comprehensive strategy to tackle all aspects of the drugs problem. For its part, the G8 is committed to partnership and shared responsibility in the international community to combat illicit drugs. This should include reinforced cooperation to curb illicit trafficking in drugs and chemical precursors, action to reduce demand in our countries, including through policies to reduce drug dependency, and support for a global approach to eradicating illicit crops. We welcome the UNDCP's global approach to eliminating or significantly reducing illicit drug production, where appropriate through effective alternative development programmes.

16 May 1998

NOTE: This statement was made available by the Office of the Press Secretary on May 16 but was not issued as a White House press release. An original was not available for verification of the content of this statement.

Remarks and an Exchange With Reporters in Birmingham, United Kingdom

May 17, 1998

Group of Eight Summit

The President. Let me just say a couple of things, and then I know you have some questions, and I'll try to answer a few of them.

First of all, I want to commend Prime Minister Blair and all of his team for putting on what I thought was one of our best G-8 meetings. This shows the benefit of these meetings not just for dealing with the issues that are in the news now—Indonesia, India, Pakistan, and other issues that are presently in the news—but also dealing with the long-term challenges we face. We did some serious work here on employment

issues, on environmental issues, on crime issues, on dealing with conversion of computers in all of our countries at the turn of the century and what kind of challenges will be presented by that, and how we can work together on them. It was a very stimulating, interesting meeting that will actually have an impact on the lives of the people that we all represent. So I thought it was quite good, and I felt good about that.

Secondly, I just had a very, very good meeting with President Yeltsin in which, once again, he assured me that he was doing his best to ratify the START II Treaty in the Duma. And we agreed that we wanted to immediately begin work on START III as soon as the ratification is secured there. I think all of us, because of the India nuclear tests, feel an even greater sense of urgency to change the debate again over nuclear issues toward less, not more; to change the whole direction here. And I think if we can get early Duma ratification we know pretty well where we are on a lot of these big START III issues, and we'd like to really get after it and turn this, the nuclear tide, back in the right direction, away from more weapons toward fewer ones. So I was quite encouraged by that.

We still have some areas where we're working with them hard to get greater results and cooperation, especially in the whole area of technology transfer to Iran, and all of you know about that. And we went over that in some significant detail and I think reached some understandings which will bear fruit in the days ahead; so I'm hopeful of that.

Anyway, it was a good meeting. He was in very, very good form, excited about his new government, proud of them, and seemed to be in as good a health and good a spirits as I've seen him in quite a long time.

So, questions?

Nuclear Proliferation in South Asia

Q. Mr. President, Pakistan's Foreign Minister told Reuters that he was very close to certain his country would conduct a nuclear test. He told the Associated Press it's not a matter of if but when. Sir, what does this do to regional stability? And could this have been avoided had, for example, Russia and France joined the U.S. in sanctions against India?

The President. Well, first of all, based on our best information, it hasn't happened yet. I also saw the Foreign Minister on television last night making substantially the same statement, but I understand it's still being debated in the Cabinet.

I understand also that they're under a lot of pressure. You can only imagine what the pressures might be. But I will say this: I still have hopes that the Prime Minister and the Pakistani Government will not go through with a nuclear test. And I believe that we can, the rest of us who would support that, can work with them in a way that meets their security interests without the test.

Furthermore, I think that over the long run, and indeed before then, the political, the economic, and the security interests of Pakistan and in Pakistan's standing in the world would be dramatically increased if they walked away from a test. The whole rest of the world would think they were stronger and would be profoundly impressed, and I think it would help us to resolve these issues more if they did not. So I hope they will not. And if they do, we'll cross that bridge when we come to it.

Now, do I think that the result would be different if everyone had as hard a line on this as we do? I can't really say that. I think if you go back and look at the statement we've put out here, this is a—everybody condemned the Indian action, including countries that were very close to India. And every country said their relations would be affected by it. And when I came here, that's the most I thought we could get, because there are lots of countries in the world that basically are opposed to sanctions under almost all circumstances except under rare cases when the UN votes for them. So we just have a different view on that.

I'm glad that we've done what we've done, even though I have enormous admiration for India's democracy and for its progress in the last several years. But all I can tell you is I'm going to do what I can to get this back on track. I hope that Pakistan won't test. I think it will help us to get it back on track, and I think it will help Pakistan immeasurably in the world community, and it will have, I believe, specific political, economic,

and security benefits to the country if it does not test.

So I'll keep working on it.

Q. Mr. President, if sanctions aren't possible, are there any other specific actions you want these other countries to take when they go home?

The President. Well, for one thing, I think a lot of countries are taking economic action: Japan is; Canada is; a number of European countries are. The European Union is going to have to debate this. I think that's one of the reasons that Prime Minister Blair, who otherwise took quite a hard line here with us—he was quite good on the language of the resolution—but I think that he thinks, as head of the EU, he has to give all these other countries the chance to be heard. I think a number of European countries will take economic actions here.

And I think that we just have to—we're going to have to work this situation to turn it back around, because what you don't want is the—insofar as possible, the best of all worlds would be that this is an isolated event. And then India signs the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty; then Pakistan says it will sign if India does, so they sign. That would be the best conceivable result.

The worst conceivable result would be for everybody that's ever worked on this to think they ought to conduct some sort of test and that this is now—it's sort of the new measure of either national security or national greatness. That's a terrible signal for the rest of us to send the world, especially when the Russians and we are doing our very best to put everything in the opposite direction and to reduce the number of nuclear weapons in the world.

So we just have to—I'm going to spend a lot of time thinking through this and coming up with an affirmative strategy to try to deal with all the elements of it and all the aspects of the problem. And in the meantime, I hope that Pakistan will find the strength necessary to walk away from a test.

1996 Campaign Financing

Q. Mr. President, there's new evidence that the Chinese Government funneled money into the American election campaign. Did you or anybody in your administration

make decisions based on the influence of Chinese money?

The President. No.

Q. And what do you feel about that evidence?

The President. For one thing, first of all, I understand there's a new allegation about that. I have two things to say about it. First of all, all of the foreign policy decisions we made were based on what we believed—I and the rest of my administration—were in the interests of the American people. Now, if someone tried to influence them, that's a different issue, and there ought to be an investigation into whether that happened. And I would support that. I have always supported that. But I can tell you that the decisions we made, we made because we thought they were in the interests of the American people.

Q. [Inaudible]—the Chinese in your visit?

The President. Well, I want to see—when I get back home, I want to see, number one, what is the substance of this; how serious is it; what are the facts; what evidence is there? Is this just somebody saying, or is there some reason to believe there is objective evidence to support this? But in any case, I think the investigation ought to proceed, and then whatever the facts are, we'll take appropriate action at the time.

Russian Ratification of START II Treaty

Q. You mentioned President Yeltsin giving you assurances on START II ratification. He's done that in the past several times.

The President. He has, but one of the things he pointed out this time is he said this thing is now in the Duma; it's actively being considered; there are a lot of committees working on it; and that he will, obviously, not only push for its ratification but argue that it ought to be considered in an even more timely fashion now because of the Indian test.

Q. Will you go to Moscow only if it is ratified, or do you have assurances now—

The President. Well, I think it ought to be ratified because then we can get more business done. We can't really do anything on START III until START II is ratified. And I'm hoping that it will. And I'd like to leave it there. I'd like to leave it there.

Q. How long would it take to ratify START III?

The President. I don't know. But I think—but actually, I think START III could be done in fairly short order because we have been, Boris Yeltsin and I, have been talking about these issues for years now, and I think we know what the parameters of our two positions are, what our national security considerations are. And so I would expect that it could be done fairly quickly once we get START II out of the way.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 1:21 p.m. outside the Hyatt Hotel. In his remarks, he referred to President Boris Yeltsin of Russia; and Minister of Foreign Affairs Gohar Ayub Khan and Prime Minister Nawaz Sharif of Pakistan.

Birmingham Group of Eight Summit Statement

May 17, 1998

Northern Ireland

We warmly welcome the Belfast Agreement reached on 10 April. We commend all those involved in achieving an outcome which reflects the fundamental aspirations of both parts of the community in Northern Ireland and secures their rights. We recognise that the Agreement must win the support of the people in Northern Ireland and the Republic of Ireland. While acknowledging that it presents challenges to all parties, we hope it will achieve the widest possible support, not only as a basis for political stability and peace but also as an opportunity for economic development and prosperity for all Northern Ireland's people. We pledge our countries' support for this process.

Indonesia

We are deeply concerned at the situation in Indonesia, especially the recent upsurge of violence and the loss of life. We deplore the killings and urge the authorities to show maximum restraint, to refrain from the use of lethal force and to respect individual rights. We call on the public to express their views peacefully. It is essential to avoid an escalation of violence.

We recognise the hardship the economic crisis has caused. We believe the economic reform programme agreed with and supported by the international financial institutions is the only way to restore confidence and growth, and fully support the government in implementing it. But successful economic reform and international support for it will require sufficient political and social stability. We will continue to work, together with the international financial institutions, to support reform and alleviate hardship.

The current social unrest indicates that, to resolve the crisis, political as well as economic reform is necessary. The need for political reform is widely acknowledged in Indonesia. We encourage the authorities to respond rapidly, by opening a dialogue which addresses the aspirations of the Indonesian people and by introducing the necessary reforms.

FRY/Kosovo

The continuing violence in Kosovo has revived fears of a new Balkans war. The region has already seen too much bloodshed. A political solution to the problem of Kosovo is vital for the peace and well-being of all the people of the region. We consider the meeting on 15 May between President Milosevic and Dr Rugova to be a positive first step. It is particularly important that President Milosevic has assumed personal responsibility in the search for a resolution of the problems of Kosovo, including its future status. We urge both sides to ensure that the dialogue now begun leads rapidly to the adoption of concrete measures to lower tensions and stop violence. Resolving the issue of Kosovo's status will be difficult but is essential for the good of all those living in the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia.

Peace and stability in Europe rest on the principles that borders are inviolable and that political change must come about through peaceful means. We reject terrorism and violence from any side to achieve political goals or to stifle dissent. The states of the region should themselves contribute to a non-violent solution to the crisis. All states should cooperate in addressing the problem of refugees and displaced persons.